





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia: 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/990,461   | 11/21/2001      | Thomas P. Burris     | ORT-1527                | 4152             |
| 27777  | 7590 07/09/2003 |                      | •                       |                  |
| AUDLEY A. CIAMPORCERO JR.  |                 |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
| JOHNSON & JOHNSON<br>ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA<br>NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003 |                 |                      | RAYMOND, F              | LICHARD L        |
|  |                 |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |                 |                      | 1624                    | 12               |
|  |                 |                      | DATE MAILED: 07/09/2003 | <b>/</b> ク       |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| 24  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|   |  | BURRIS ET AL.   |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary   | 09/990,461<br>Examiner   | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   |  | 1624  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication ap   | Richard L. Raymond   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Period for Reply  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status | 136(a). In no event, however, may oly within the statutory minimum of the will apply and will expire SIX (6) Me, cause the application to become | a reply be timely filed  nirty (30) days will be considered timely.  DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |
| Responsive to communication(s) filed on   | ·  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | his action is non-final.   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under <b>Disposition of Claims</b>   | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 (  | C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |  |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 6) Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.  Application Papers   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)   | •  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) §</li> </ol>  | 5) Notice of   | w Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 09/990,461

Art Unit: 1624

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Response to Preliminary Amendment

1. This application is a divisional of Serial No. 09/854,302, now U.S. Patent No. 6,555,536. The preliminary amendment amended claims 13 and 15. The claims pending are claims 1-19.

#### Obviousness-type Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of parent U.S. Patent No. 6,555,536. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because overlapping subject matter is involved. Note, for example, that the A definition in the present application merely adds a  $-N(R^1)(SO_2R)$  group, the G definition adds an  $-OR^8$  group and the A proviso in the present application includes  $C_{7-10}$  alkyl. Also, the species of claim 9 corresponds

Application/Control Number: 09/990,461

Art Unit: 1624

to the species of claims 6 and 7 of the patent. One set of claims would be rejectable over the other.

- 4. Claims 1-19 are further provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of copending Application No. 09/853,798, now in issue. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because again, overlapping subject matter which would constitute prior art over each other is involved.
- 5. This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### Showing of Common Ownership

6. Since a common assignee, but different inventive entity is involved with respect to Serial No. 09/853,798 above, a showing of common ownership at the time of the invention is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claims 1 and 2, the R<sup>5</sup> and R<sup>6</sup> definition falls within the formulas of the G definition. Correction is requested.

Application/Control Number: 09/990,461

Art Unit: 1624

### Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 1-19 would be allowable upon overcoming the Section 112, second paragraph rejection and the obviousness-type double patenting rejections above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard L. Raymond whose telephone number is (703) 308-4523. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (9:30AM-8:00PM)).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mukund J. Shah can be reached on 305-4716. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Primary Examinér

Art Unit 1624

July 8, 2003